

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CLARA VARGAS,

Plaintiff,

No. 14-10493

v.

District Judge David M. Lawson
Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen

CITY OF NOVI, MACY'S, KELLY
SERVICES, INFO TREE SERVICES,
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, LEE
GAVIN, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF
THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, NISSAN
MOTOR COMPANY, INC., and UNITED
STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Defendant.

/

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's self-styled Motion to Reach Judgment under Rule 58 and 59(c) [Doc. #80]. In the body of the motion, Plaintiff also cites Fed.R.Civ.P. 50(b), 52(b), 59, and 60.

Rule 50(b) pertains to renewing a motion for judgment as a matter of law *after a jury trial*. There has been no trial, with or without a jury.

Rule 52(b) deals with amended findings after entry of judgment in a bench trial. Again, there has been no trial.

Rule 58 does not address substantive or factual issues, but pertains to the entry of judgments following substantive rulings by the Court.

Rule 59 pertains to motions to amend judgments or for new trial. There has been no trial, and judgment has not yet been entered.

Rule 60 deals with motions for relief from judgment. No judgment has been

entered in this case, although I have recommended dismissal of Defendant City of Novi.

The Plaintiff has no idea what she is doing. Her lack of understanding of procedure is remarkable, even for a *pro se* litigant. This motion would be worthy of Rule 11 sanctions, but instead, I will simply deny it.

Plaintiff's Motion to Reach Judgment [Doc. #80] is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/R. Steven Whalen

R. STEVEN WHALEN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: January 21, 2015

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was sent to parties of record on January 21, 2015, electronically and/or by U.S. mail.

s/Carolyn M. Ciesla

Case Manager